REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-11 were rejected. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-11 have been amended for clarification, and claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice. New claim 12 has been added. Thus, claims 1 and 3-12 are pending and under consideration. No new matter has been added. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(a):

At item 2 of the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-3, 3-5, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,088,625 ('625).

'625 discusses a system and method for creating assembly data including a component version consisting of graphics and data, and assembly version consisting of additional graphics and data, dimensions, material list box, etc.

The present invention discloses a system and method for managing computer-aided design (CAD) data including assembly data and parts data that include version information in relation to the parts.

The Examiner compares the '625 system for creating data regarding parts of an object and relationship thereof with the present invention that manages CAD data including assembly and parts data having version information. In '625, a user instructs the CAD application to start a new assembly drawing or defines new parts to cause the newly defined parts to be added to the assembly drawing (see, column 6, lines 2-14 of '625). The '625 assigns a part number to the created assembly if none was assigned, saves the assembly drawing and assembly data, and stores a master record for the created assembly (see, column 6, lines 21-33 of '625). This means that the stored data in relation to the assembly inclusive assembly information having the parts included therein.

The present invention provides a system for managing CAD data including storing and maintaining version related information of *individual* parts forming the assembly. As recited in amended independent claims 1, 10 and 11, a unit is displayed based on "parts data including data about shapes of parts and version information about versions of the parts" where the assembly data defines a structure of the unit formed by the parts. Further, "the version information is assigned to the assembly data when the assembly data and parts data of the unit displayed are stored in a storage unit" (see, amended independent claims 1, 10 and 11). This allows the present invention to maintain a version of each part forming the assembly data. The

'625 system does not teach or suggest displaying a unit based on "assembly data and parts data" where the parts data includes "data about shapes of parts and version information about versions of the parts". Instead, the '625 system stores a master record for an assembly, such as quantity, stock flag, purchased flag, etc. (see, column 6, lines 27-33 of '625).

It is submitted that the independent claims 1, 10 and 11 are patentable over '625.

For at least the above-mentioned and additional reasons, claims depending from independent claims 1, 10 and 11 are patentably distinguishable over '625. For example, as recited in claim 5, part of the parts data according to the present invention includes "part of the parts data is sub-assembly data that defines a sub-unit formed by one or more other parts". The '625 system does not teach or suggest part data including "sub-assembly data that defines a sub-unit formed by one or more other parts".

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

At item 4 of the outstanding Office Action, claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over '625, and claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of '625 in view of over U.S. Patent No. 5,777,877 ('877).

'877 discuss a processing device and method for making arrangements for parts used in products.

The arguments presented about distinguishing independent claim 1 are incorporated herein because dependent claims 4, 8 and 9 depend from claim 1.

The Examiner acknowledges that '325 does not teach the computer readable medium as recited in claims 8 and 9 based on their dependency from claim 1. However, the Examiner gives OFFICIAL NOTICE that when a copy of a file is produced, all information about the data file is copied, and that editing a copy of an original document produces a new one.

The Applicants respectfully point out that claims 8 and 9 recite, "assigning initialized version information to a copy of the assembly data when the copy of the assembly data is made" and "diverting, when the assembly data used to form a first product is diverted to a second product, the version information about the assembly data of the first product to diverted assembly data of the second product", respectively. The features recited in claims 8 and 9 refer to parts forming an assembly where the assembly data defines the structure of a unit. Thus, the rejection based on the OFFICIAL NOTICE is hereby traversed.

6

Accordingly, the Applicants request that the Examiner cite a reference in support of the position relied upon to give the OFFCIAL NOTICE. MPEP §2144.03.

Further, claim 4 recites, causing the parts of a unit to be displayed "on the basis of parts data of a version different from a latest version when the display request is directed to states of parts at registration of the parts". This is unlike the '877 system where part numbers resulting from the recomposition following application of different rules to the parts (see, column 7, lines 59-65 of '877).

The burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness based upon the prior art lies with the Examiner. In re Fritch, 23 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992). According to In re Fritch, the Examiner "... can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references." The Applicants respectfully assert that none of the cited references disclose CAD data management system and method that displays "assembly data and parts data in response to a display request" where the parts data includes "data about shapes of parts and version information about versions of the parts, the assembly data defining a structure of the unit formed by one or more parts".

Therefore, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 12 has been added to emphasize a method of managing CAD data including displaying a unit based on assembly data and parts data having "information related to shapes of the parts and version information related to the parts". Further, the method includes, "assigning the version information related to the parts to the assembly data" where the assembly data forms s structure of the unit formed by the parts. This enables CAD data managing method that maintains version information regarding each part forming the assembly. The '625 does not teach or suggest "assigning the version information related to the parts to the assembly".

Accordingly, newly added claim 12 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-11have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled, and new claim 12 has been added. Thus, claims 1 and 3-12 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the

application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

TAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____7/9/4_____   By: _____

J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

8